

Christian Education

Vol. VI

JANUARY 1923

No. 4

OCTOBER, 1922-JULY, 1923

Published Monthly, Omitting August and September, by
THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

Robert L. Kelly, *Editor*
111 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

O. D. Foster, *Associate Editor*

Contributing Editors

George W. Richards, *The Conference on Theological Seminaries*
Charles Foster Kent, *The Association of Biblical Instructors in American
Colleges and Secondary Schools*

Entered as second-class matter October 24, 1921, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918.

The subscription price is 50 cents per annum; ten or more subscriptions 40 cents each, 10 cents must be added if payment is made by check. Single copies 10 cents each.

ORDER OF CONTENTS

VITALIZING THE COLLEGE CHAPEL	187
<i>Harry M. Gage</i>	
COLLEGE CHAPEL	195
<i>Rev. Paul Micou, M.A.</i>	
VITALIZING BIBLE STUDY	198
<i>Clyde E. Wildman</i>	
THE RELATION OF BIBLICAL DEPARTMENTS TO THE CUR- RICULA OF LIBERAL COLLEGES	205
<i>Robert L. Kelly</i>	
THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN A LIBERAL EDUCATION OF TODAY	210
<i>Samuel R. Braden</i>	

REQUEST FOR NOVEMBER ISSUE

Unfortunately the November issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION is completely exhausted. We will appreciate it very much if subscribers who can spare their copies will send them in to the office. For all such received we shall be glad to extend the annual subscription by one issue.—EDITOR.

Christian Education

Vol. VI

JANUARY, 1923

No. 4

VITALIZING COLLEGE CHAPEL

PRESIDENT HARRY M. GAGE, Coe College.

Vital elements are the necessary ones. They are the differential qualities of things as they are and the elements which must be supplied in order that things may become what they ought to be. Worship is the vital element in college chapel. Without it the service is not a chapel service. If the daily assembly of students and faculty has lost vitality, that is to say, has lost character as a service of worship, the vitalizing element of worship must be restored in order that the service may become what it is supposed to be.

My opinions of chapel service are based on an experience which covers the major portion of my life and all of my student and professional life. During those twenty-seven years I have been in daily attendance at college chapel services. For eleven years I have served as college dean and am now serving my tenth year as college president. During much of that time I have, sometimes from necessity and sometimes from choice, assumed entire responsibility for the chapel service. As college president I have always conducted the service when at home. I estimate, therefore, that I have led at least sixteen hundred chapel services. In the course of such an experience I have gained a few clear impressions. Some of these impressions are convictions. All of my present opinions and practices must be interpreted and somewhat discounted with regard to the fact that they are born of experience with my own limitations.

I ought to say that without exception my experiences in chapel

have been happy. Save for a portion of one year during which I made chapel my chief business and conducted all but five of the services, I have always enjoyed a distinctly spiritual atmosphere in chapel. At times I have been tempted, but I have never yielded to the temptation, to call for order or attention. I do not mean that I have not always had order and attention. I have never been humiliated by disorder and never interrupted by an uproarious and disconcerting college prank. I am perfectly sure that such an experience awaits me and I have for years known what I shall do when the time comes. I know, too, that in all probability I shall then do something different. One knows nothing at all about college chapel if one does not know that the leader must be prepared for both usual and unusual situations.

Dreary routine devitalizes chapel services. There must, of course, be a sufficient regularity and uniformity of procedure to facilitate entrance and exit of students and to expedite the program. Otherwise the situation is as variable as all vital things are. The successful chapel leader must be sensitive to emotional atmosphere. He must be the sort of man who when he suddenly comes upon a group of people who have been in conversation for some time will sense the set of the group mind, the bent of its will. He must be able on going into chapel to feel intuitively what the human situation is and he must be able and willing to adapt himself to the mood of the morning. The situation frequently baffles the most refined intuitive sense. More frequently one leaves chapel with the feeling that he has failed in readiness of response or in power to create on the spur of the moment a favorable spiritual attitude. As experience accumulates I have increasing assurance that I can detect the general attitude by the manner of students in entering chapel, their attitude during the first moment of quiet and especially by the singing of the opening song. It is then that one must decide quickly how to make the morning's service vital.

The foregoing observations indicate the central importance of chapel in college life. Chapel is essentially a mobilization of the college. The true meaning of mobilization is best indicated by pronouncing the word to show its parentage in the word *Mob*. Crowds have moods and also a power of quick response to leader-

ship. It is just the integration of attention and emotion by leadership which makes a mob out of a crowd. And many chapel services have been ruined by the unwillingness of the president to come down to the level of the obvious human situation and contest for leadership with a stray cat.

Chapel is the college president's supreme and only opportunity to pitch the life of each day in the proper key. If there be no chapel service or if the opportunity presented is lost the consciousness of the college is sure to be disintegrated. Something akin to multiple personality results. The possibilities of divisive consciousness are truly alarming. In Coe, for instance, the department of journalism has listed seventy-seven different sources of college news. A really vital chapel mobilizes these widely varying interests. It gives to them all the "unity of the Spirit." It makes college life holy in the sense that life then has a divine wholeness or completeness. Life is saved from corruption, that is, it is not allowed to go all to pieces.

Chapel service is the surest revelation of the character and spirit of a college. There one may learn that college life is unified or disintegrated. One may learn too the nature of such unity as a college has. I have frequently said that if I wished to learn quickly the spirit of a college I would visit chapel and turn the pages of the junior annual.

I trust the revelation of a chapel service because no one is able to frame a radical and sudden change of spirit in chapel. It is as impossible as it is to make the visiting minister believe that family prayers are usually said. Anyone who ever ventured such a deceit made only a sorry exhibition of himself. I make these observations in full recognition of the fact that any particular chapel service may be unusually bad or good. It is, however, easy to distinguish the incidental from the abiding spirit of a chapel service.

Chapel is the president's best opportunity to exercise leadership. It also tests the qualities which are vital to his presidency. Leading college chapel is a most searching and trying experience. I cannot name any experience that is more so. One meets the same people day after day, month after month, year after year. These people take one's measure. They spot all one's peculiari-

ties. They know every one of the man's essential viewpoints. They know his pet phrases and bits of poetry. Before long the leader of chapel services awakes to a realization that these people whom he faces daily really know him. Then he must be willing to face them naturally. The most innocuous forms of pretense will not do.

The trial of a man in the leadership of the chapel service is such that there he feels more than at any other point his leadership of the college. There a man's position in the college is very helpfully revealed to himself. There he may know how he is getting on in the discharge of his most important duty—the leadership of the college community. In chapel a man's insight, courage and character are tested. He must choose to fill and kill time or to deal radically with the realities of life. Chapel services lose vitality if the leader fails to heed the admonition of Jesus, "What ye hear in the ear, that tell ye from the housetops." When chapel services open it is time to speak out. One cannot be wholly responsible for what is done in and about the college. But one is wholly responsible for the proclamation of the ideals to which every Christian college in its very articles of incorporation is dedicated. At times one leaves chapel with a sad heart feeling that ideals are far from realized and saying to himself:

"What I aspired to be
And was not, comforts me,
A brute I might have been,
But would not sink i' the scale."

Such services have, however, been unusually vital. Years of experience tell me that. I can also bring in evidence packets of letters written and words spoken by students out of college and telling me plainly enough that listening to the inner voice and speaking out in chapel is usually profitable.

The college president's life is a delightful social experience; never more so than in chapel. Nevertheless he is certain to feel at some time each year—probably two or three times each year—a loneliness in his leadership. He feels it when he stands in chapel and touches as delicately and tactfully and accurately as possible some vital point, a point so vital that it is easily irri-

tated. Of course the president must touch such points. Otherwise he must touch dull and insensitive points. Then his chapel service will be dull, insensitive and dead. On such occasions as I have in mind the president feels really lonesome. Having lived through such experiences I have become convinced that the boy on the burning deck is the grandest character recorded in human history. He stood alone. Everyone else had scampered. Everyone looked at him and wondered what he would do next. Not yet being recorded as an admirable hero no one envied him his position. Onlookers probably thought his conspicuous danger foolhardy. Following several momentous occasions when I have had occasion to deal with some vital situation I have had every possible evidence—expressions on faces, the manners of people, pointed and hot words, telephone messages and letters *ad infinitum*, numerous signed petitions, newspaper editorials mailed to me gratuitously and anonymously—that no one on earth agreed with me. Only my dear little friend phronesis, as Aristotle in his Nicomachean Ethics calls intuitive judgment or common sense, tells me at such times that I am right. Looking backward I know that at such times I have really vitalized chapel service, vitalized, too, students, faculty, the immediate public and the whole college constituency.

To be specific, you may be interested to know that three years ago I gave in chapel some very commonplace and common-sense views of marriage. I spoke of marriage as a civil contract and as a divinely sanctioned status. Of course I spoke of home and our homes and of homes to be founded. Then I added that I did not recommend run-away, or clandestine or informal marriages. I was deluged with all sorts of opinions on the subject. I received clipped editorials from Pennsylvania and Oklahoma. A friend in San Francisco wrote to ask if I needed the services of an alienist. Generally I was invited to mind my own business. It is actually true that no one agreed with me so far as I could tell from anything written or said to me. Of course phronesis remained a true friend. So I really knew all the time that nearly every one did agree with me. Nevertheless, it is not enjoyable to stand alone when everyone has skedaddled and come to chapel obviously wondering what prexie is going to say and do next.

Incidentally, I wonder why good people who are at once sincere friends and critics of the Christianity of Christian colleges are so inaudible when a man needs and deserves a friend. I certainly do love and appreciate phronesis.

I shall speak now in less general terms. First, a number of rules.

1. Guard the chapel rostrum jealously. The indiscriminate admission of the multitude of peripatetic propagandists to the privileges of the rostrum will devitalize the service and disintegrate the mind of the college. Only a few of the visitors in chapel should be asked or allowed to speak.

2. When speakers who are not members of the college community are welcomed the president should keep the initiative in himself. Each visiting speaker if he is wise will appear to help in the execution of some phase of the college program. If the president is wise, he will not allow the situation to be otherwise.

3. Open services promptly.

4. Be sure that you have quiet and worshipful attention when you rise for your part in the service.

5. Keep the services moving rapidly. Students move that way. If attention secured in the beginning is lost it can seldom be regained.

6. Bring music to your aid in the service of worship.

7. Never run the services overtime.

8. Close the services when they are done even if the allotted time has not elapsed.

9. Read only brief passages of scripture. Be sure that this passage contains one complete idea. If necessary state in your own words what the idea is before and after reading. Say enough and only enough to make the idea clear. But stick to the Scripture until it is clear. Then state your object in presenting this idea. To illustrate. Read, "Let every man prove his own work. Then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone and not in another." When the idea is clear, then state that examinations will begin tomorrow. Do not labor the point. Do not even state it, if perchance the audience sees it in advance.

10. Make your prayers brief and definite.

11. After prayer say anything that needs to be said or may

be helpfully said about anything. Find opportunity to state your conception of your job, and the job of the faculty and students. Speak frankly about the constitution of the college, its organization, and purposes. Explain the various organizations of the college and what they are doing or may do to further the purposes of the college. Range freely over matters of general human interest. Never scold. Never complain. Never nag students about your "pet peeve." Do not return frequently to the same subject, and do not ride your hobby more than once in a semester. Never usurp the time of others.

12. Make a clear separation between the scripture reading, prayer, and general remarks and the business meeting in which important announcements are made or the work of the day or week outlined and explained.

13. Make a clear separation between this business meeting and the mass meeting which may follow. This may be a student business meeting or it may consist of special music by soloists, clubs, or that whole group. Student business meetings are held by the Honor Board, The Student Council, the Athletic Council, the Junior Annual Committee, the Student Volunteers and American Fellowship, the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Cosmopolitan Club, the Big Brothers, the Big Sisters, the Staff of the College Paper, the Komensky Society with its Coe Camp for Tuberculous Children in Czechoslovakia, the Committees in charge of the Philippine Fund and the Student Friendship Fund.

In working out a chapel service I have adopted the following plan. I introduced the plan by enumerating the most commendable features of college life. I then added that of all good things done the chapel service was least commendable, that it was not bad, that it was in fact good, but not the best possible service. I asked that each chapel service be to a stranger a revelation of the fine life of the institution. It was my conviction that the chief difficulty was waste of time and sometimes failure to secure quiet attention in the beginning. The difficulty next in importance was the fact that in a period of twenty-seven minutes we attempted sometimes to hold three meetings, namely: a meeting for worship, a meeting for college business, and a mass meeting expressive of student life. These meetings intruded upon one

another and became inveterately involved. Worship sometimes appeared as an interloper and was sometimes in danger of being crowded out. To remedy the difficulty I proposed first of all to secure a favorable opening of the chapel service. The opening must be always a favorable approach to the initial service of worship. So I proposed and preached a two-minute period of quiet relaxation just before the scripture reading. With this introduction I outlined the following order. At 9:25 in the morning, the organist, whose insight, skill and devotion make the whole plan possible, begins to play. By 9:40 from fifty to a hundred or more have come in to listen. At 9:40 the rush at the entrances is on. The organist then opens up with a greater volume of sound. At 9:42 he sounds the chimes briefly. Immediately following he sounds the chords of some well known hymn or song or of the doxology. All rise to sing. During the singing late comers find their seats.

Following this the organist plays very softly for two minutes or occasionally the choir, which is always in place, sings very softly. This is preliminary to worship. When the reading of scripture, prayer, hymn and remarks are finished I retire and take no further part in the chapel service. This marks the end of the service of worship. The college business meeting is then in charge of one of the professors who makes such statements and announcements as he chooses. His judgment is final in these matters. When he is done he announces the student organization and the student who will have charge of the student meeting or introduces the Director of the School of Music who will have charge of the musical program. The professor and I then retire from the rostrum. This marks the end of the business meeting. Two warning bells ring toward the close of the chapel period, one at 10:03 and one at 10:05. At 10:07 the final bell rings. The organist plays during the exit. It must be noted that we seldom have the three separate meetings fully emphasized the same day. But we always give full emphasis to the service of worship. We designate days for music and college business and schedule in advance days for student business.

It may be interesting to note that when I announced this plan I ended by saying that I was done speaking on that subject and

that I would never go over it or mention it again in chapel. However, I placarded the campus for ten days. Each placard read, Lest We Forget. At the end of ten days the placards were taken down and the new order of chapel service was in successful operation. That was three years ago. Justice to our students requires me to say that our chapel service continues to be good. I hope that Big Brothers and Sisters will continue to tell new students about our way and that our present service will become an invariable tradition.

COLLEGE CHAPEL

THE REV. PAUL MICOU, M. A.,
*College Secretary of the Episcopal Department of
Religious Education*

I want to speak of college chapel as one of the most powerful instruments for spiritual development in our colleges, and yet one of the most neglected. I think I am in position to bear rather wide testimony in this matter, for I was for years a student secretary for the Y. M. C. A. and spoke in scores of college chapels during my travels.

As an Episcopalian I have a love for liturgical forms of worship, but I am keenly aware of certain dangers. Liturgical worship can become formal and heartless. The service can be run through hurriedly and butchered. If the form is unchanged from day to day, the students will consider it monotonous.

However, when the service is well rendered and varied, the liturgical forms of worship have certain distinct advantages. They are formal, and therefore blend in well with academic tradition and ceremony. The use of a choir with vestments lends dignity, and marks the opening and ending of chapel proper. The chapel itself is generally a building used mainly for worship, and if other meetings are held, as for instance a student meeting, after chapel, the proceedings are conducted with due decorum, and the students do not make light of them.

Liturgical worship is far from formal when due regard is paid to variety, to the observance of occasions and seasons, and to bringing out the inner meaning of the scripture lessons, the

hymns and the prayers. Consider some of the forms of service available to the liturgist: formal services like "morning or evening prayer," litanies, meditations, services of silence or directed intercession, and services of praise by the use of psalms and hymns. The trouble is, according to my own observation, variety is not enough introduced into chapel exercises where liturgical services are the rule. Usually the only variety comes in "shortening" the customary form, when there chances to be a speaker.

The very formality, however, is useful. Thus tables of lessons lead to continuity of Bible reading. The use of the Lord's Prayer, general confessions and thanksgivings in unison enable the students to share in the service, and the recitation of the Creed deepens in them a knowledge of the fundamental facts of our Christian faith. The observance of the Christian Year is also a most potent influence in teaching our Lord's Life and its meaning in Christian conduct today. Thus there is definiteness and the sense of a goal which lies yet ahead in the round of liturgical worship. The silences before and after the service, when the students are taught to have their own private devotions are most helpful to bring to them a sense of the presence of the One whom they have assembled to worship.

In liturgical worship many parts can be taken by students, thus giving them training in the conduct of services and an opportunity for the expression of the religious life. Notices are generally given out by the President of the Student Body arranged in academic form.

Most important of all in the chapels of the Episcopalian colleges are the celebrations of the Holy Communion. The attendance at this service is, of course, voluntary. The quiet half hour of fellowship with our Lord at His own Table, often in the early hours of the morning, imparts a depth of purpose to life and a seriousness to religion which can be obtained in no other way.

But my experience has been even more in college chapels where the liturgical plays no special part. There is one fundamental difference at the outset. Few of these colleges have buildings or halls reserved exclusively for worship. The daily service is held in an auditorium given over on other occasions to everything

from a musical comedy to a debate. The service itself is more of the nature of a college assembly than of worship. College yells greet a popular speaker, notices of every kind of organization, serious and comic, are given out, and a student orchestra plays unworshipful selections. The students themselves are often not in a spiritual frame of mind and too frequently are, as one of them put it, "most awfully bored." Those who know the situation will realize that the following description of chapel services in one of our great Eastern colleges is not of an unusual situation.

"Compulsory chapel in this community does not seem to tend toward religion. Occasionally, when an unusually forceful speaker is present, he will compel the attention of the students, or the President of the college when he addresses them will gain their respectful listening. Otherwise little attention is paid by a large group to anything which may be going on in the pulpit. The attitude of many in the college chapel is a scandal. Newspapers, magazines, books, conversation, laughter, sitting down during the singing of hymns, and sitting up through the prayers are quite often to be observed. Many of the more thoughtful men regret this condition. Some think that the only solution is to do away with compulsory attendance. Others feel that a strong man constantly at the helm might change the situation. The graduates do not favor giving up compulsory chapel."

I, myself, have observed similar conditions in other colleges, when I have been able to sit in the gallery and look down on the students below, restless under the monotonous leadership of a professor who has long since lost the heart for college chapel. I can recall other places where chapel has been adjourned for a "pep" rally in the same room preceding a game.

Nor is the charge of formalism to be leveled at the liturgist alone. My observation is that the non-liturgical worship consists of an unvarying round, day after day, of hymn, scripture reading, talk, prayer and hymn. The only variation is in the things sung, read and prayed. Furthermore, this particular formalism gives the student no opportunity to share in worship, save the singing of the hymns, or the responsive reading sometimes substituted for reading of the scripture by one person.

But when these defects are noted and corrected certain great advantages adhere in the non-liturgical forms of worship. It is

an advantage to assemble the college for the transaction of public business, and it dignifies and elevates such an assembly to have it begun by a service, provided the transition from worship to business can be made properly. The freedom from the shackles of the printed page should be used to introduce the same wide variety of worship that was noted above as possible for the liturgist. Thus the students, who are a cross section of modern Protestantism, can be led from barrenness into plenty, and have their souls enriched by a beauty in worship which leads to God.

The one thing most needed in America today is a sense of reverence, an appreciation of the value of the spiritual. We have been told in these meetings that religion alone has the power to unify and interpret the college curriculum, and hence the Christian college is a great need in our educational system. Now college chapel fills this need *par excellence*. He sins greatly against what is finest in our students, who allows in chapel any light treatment of sacred moments and things. Our students come before us to be lifted into the presence of God once each day, and it is our solemn duty and responsibility to do this for them. College Chapel can be the greatest means of bringing reverence and awe and divine Love into the hearts of the nations future leaders. Let us study every possible way of securing this result.

VITALIZING BIBLE STUDY

PROFESSOR CLYDE E. WILDMAN, Cornell College.

In what I have to say I do not have in mind the voluntary classes of the colleges and universities, neither do I have in mind the graduate student of the theological school. The field with which I deal is the curriculum courses in our undergraduate institutions. I do not claim to speak with any great degree of authority or originality, but I hope to say a few practical things from the point of view of one who is at present a Bible teacher in one of our colleges.

The key to the vitalizing of any study is to arouse an interest in the subject and I take it that Bible study is not different in this

regard from any other subject.

The question, therefore, is:

How, then, can we create interest in the study of the Bible?

(1) In the first place we can appeal to the student's desire for a broad culture. George Eliot tells us in *Daniel Deronda* of a character who had a hazy idea about the Jews. He knew but little about them but he thought they were a class of people who denied the Old Testament because it proved the New. This is the condition of many of our college students to-day. They have very hazy ideas about the Bible and in many cases an earnest desire to know it better. The young theological student who referred to the cave of Machpelah as Moses' father-in-law and the freshman in an English class who talked about Golgothic architecture are not without companions in all of our colleges. It takes but a little while to convince a college class in Bible that they know but little about the subject and of course this intellectual humility is a fine preparation for the educative process to follow. Just as a matter of culture and general education the average student feels a sad need for training in the English Bible. He feels that the Bible has claims as literature as well as Shakespeare and that whatever else he reads he should be somewhat familiar with the "best-seller" and the great English classic. Many students can be won to an interest in the Bible through this cultural appeal.

(2) Another way to create an interest in the Bible is to relate it to the intellectual, social, and human interests of the day. The time is past when we can teach the first two chapters of Genesis and ignore the doctrine of evolution. Our students are being taught concerning the doctrine of evolution in their biology and geology classes and they want to know what bearing evolution has upon the first two chapters of Genesis. When we come to the story of the flood we cannot ignore the fact that there is a Babylonian story of the flood in the British Museum. When one comes to the cry for justice in the book of Amos the whole thing needs to be related to the modern demand for justice in private, national, and international life. If the Bible is related to the present movements in intellectual and social life, there can be a great deal of interest stimulated. If we do not relate Bible teaching

to the present, we need not be surprised if the Bible department loses its grip on an institution. To put dynamic into the Bible courses they must be related to the great human interests of the present. The Bible grew out of human experience and that is the reason why it appeals to human experience.

I have heard it said that in the ritual introducing a Hindu priest into the duties of his office the young candidate is asked seven times, "Art thou a human being?" And the young novitiate must solemnly reply, "I am." The present day student wants the Bible related to the great problems of human life and the teacher who can do this successfully will have no trouble about making the Bible live. How human nature stands out in the Genesis story of Adam and Eve. When Adam is confronted with his sin, he replies, "The woman thou gavest me, she tempted me and I did eat." And when Eve is confronted with her wrongdoing, she replies, "The serpent beguiled me and I did eat." How human it is to shift responsibility. Endless opportunities come to the teacher of the Bible to relate it to life and by so doing its study is made interesting and vital.

(3) Another thing that will do much to vitalize Bible study is a reasonable amount of literary and historical criticism.

All of my hearers may not agree with me in what I am going to say and I ask you to go with me only so far as you can. I do not think that the college is the place for a *course* in the Sources of the Hexateuch. The student should be familiar with the A B C's before he does much with X Y Z's. I believe the student should know something about the sources of the Hexateuch and the modern documentary hypothesis. But I do not think that he needs a *whole course* in that subject. I think that the student should be acquainted with the main features of the Synoptic Problem, otherwise he will not be an intelligent student of the Life of Christ. But I do not think that we are to analyze the Gospels to death in a college course. That is perfectly proper for the research student of the university and is very necessary there, but I personally do not think that the college is the place for this detailed study. There is such a thing as pulverizing the statue so as to study it in more detail. But the question that then arises is, Where is the statue? Even

the college student should know the general problems connected with the origin of the Hexateuch and the Synoptic Gospels. I do not find that they are very much scared at our old critical friends J, E, D, P, and Q. But after all the great thing is to bring them a living, vital, and real picture of the Christ with whom the Gospels deal. It is not scholarship for the sake of scholarship but scholarship for the sake of the accurate and living picture of the historical Jesus that we want. Our emphasis in the college should not be so much upon the curriculum as upon character. The student rather than the subject is the thing to emphasize. Just as the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, so our curriculum is for the sake of the student rather than the student for the sake of the curriculum.

Professor E. C. Moore tells us that one time he visited a school where the class was reading the fourteenth chapter of the first book of *Caesar*. In this chapter Caesar tells of a conference with the German chieftain Divico and his retainers. Caesar was urging that they should be peaceable and that they should give hostages as pledges that they would be peaceable. At this the German leader arose and expressed only one sentiment, "Our fathers have taught us to receive hostages but not to give them." Professor Moore waited to see what the question would be, for it was a most unusual scene. The love of liberty in the German chieftain was defying the mighty power of Rome itself and refused to be crushed. Two majestic forces faced each other there in that ancient forest. And this was the question, What mood follows *uti*? No wonder the students in that class hated Latin.

In our colleges we have to have more than the roots and stems of Greek and Hebrew verbs. Such roots and stems are too severe a diet for the average college class. We need always to remember that we are dealing with a group of undergraduate students, that they have a faith which must be respected, and that we must replace everything that we tear down with something that is better than what was there before. But at the same time we cannot dodge the clear teachings of modern biblical science even in dealing with college students. Perhaps it is true that the results rather than the methods of historical and literary criticism should be the thing we teach. It is never wise for the doctor to

show the patient the long array of knives that he expects to use. It may affect his heart. But a proper use of the fruits of literary and historical criticism will do much to vitalize the study of the Bible. Amos is an altogether new book when it is seen over against the materialistic background of the eighth century B.C. with Assyria hanging like a dark cloud upon the horizon. We will be in a position to know more about the book when we picture the moral and religious, the social and historical conditions of the time in which Amos lived. The student who learns all he can about the Corinth of Paul's day, reads the account in Acts of the founding of the church at Corinth, and finds out what happened after Paul left there before he wrote his letter,—this student will be in a much better position to appreciate the epistle with this background than he could otherwise be.

The reconstruction of the background of a book, the determination of the authorship, the reproduction in so far as we can of the circumstances under which a book was written will do much to vitalize the study of the Bible. I do not see how anyone can teach the Bible successfully and with reverent accuracy unless he does this very thing.

Students are also interested in some of the problems connected with the text. They are quick to see the differences between the Authorized Version and the Revised Version and they naturally inquire as to how that has come about. The story of the ancient manuscripts especially the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian are always of great interest. They have neither the equipment nor the inclination to go into the intimate study of the text in the original languages. But they do appreciate the problems that are involved and it is easy at this point to secure their respect for the scholars who have done much service in this field of labor.

(4) I think the courses in Bible study can be vitalized by making them fairly hard. I do not suggest this as a means of making them popular. But to have the reputation around college of being a "snap" course will do more to kill a Bible department than anything else. It is therefore a good thing to "flunk" a few students who really deserve it once in a while. It is not a good thing for the idea to out around college that "everybody gets through in Bible." Justice as well as mercy should be a

part of the Bible professor's makeup. The course should be so conducted as to have the *respect* of the other members of the faculty and the thinking students on the campus. This cannot be done if the courses are "snap" courses. The hardest examination I ever took as an undergraduate was one in Bible and it had a wholesome effect upon me.

We dare not teach the Bible simply as it is taught in the Sunday School if we want to receive curriculum credit for it. It must have, to vitalize it, the respect that comes through the consciousness that the credits received in it are actually earned.

(5) The chief way to vitalize Bible Study is to put the emphasis upon the moral and religious aspects of the teaching. There is no reason why this should not be done in a church controlled school. The history of the Hebrews is interesting, the bearing of the Bible upon the science of Comparative Religions is very important, it has sections of literary value perhaps unsurpassed in the English language, but after all, the chief reason for which we study the Bible is for the revelation that it contains of the nature of God and of the interrelationships of man to man and group to group. I have been somewhat interested in the attempts to teach the Old Testament as literature and history without any reference to religion. I do not feel that it can be successfully done. One might just as well try to play *Hamlet* leaving out *Hamlet* or *She Stoops to Conquer* without Tony Lumpkin as to teach the history of the Old Testament and leave out religion, for the religion is the main thing in the Old Testament. What we have in the pages of the Old Testament is not history in the ordinary sense; we have a philosophy of History, or better still a theology of History. Where else do we find history written with epitaphs like this, "He did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah" or "He did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah." After David commits adultery with Bathsheba and murders Uriah the Hittite we have the significant word, "But the thing that David did displeased the Lord." And so Old Testament history was written—all the way through there is the moral and spiritual emphasis. We can trace the religious history of the Hebrews until they emerge as a people who believe in ethical monotheism and that is the greatest contribution the

Jew ever made to the world. I believe it to be the greatest contribution ever made by any nation in the history of the human spirit, a contribution that even surpasses the contribution made by Greece and Rome. To trace that development in the pages of the Old Testament and its fulfillment in the New Testament is a fascinating study for college students. I feel that some teachers put too much emphasis upon the processes of literary and historical criticism as ends in themselves and not enough emphasis upon the moral and religious truths that these processes reveal. On the other hand, there are teachers who never refer to the problems of literary and historical criticism in the fear that they will disturb their students. They content themselves with the moral and religious truth and with these alone. I feel that there is a mean between these two extremes. It is the business of the college professor to find that mean. We need in our day a rebirth of the Greek spirit that seeks for balance and harmony, the avoidance of extremes. Some are "long" on criticism and scholarship and "short" on appreciation; others are "long" on appreciation and "short" on scholarship. The one who finds the proper balance between the two will be the one who will do the most to vitalize Bible study. At the present time I believe the Scotch scholars are as near to the proper balance in this matter as any in the world.

But someone says, "How can an emphasis upon the moral and religious aspects of the Bible be an aid in vitalizing the study of the Bible? College students are not interested in religion." It is true that they do not care for a religion that is not intellectually honest and morally adequate but they are interested in a religion of the real, sincere kind. The very strongest factor in the vitalizing of Bible study to-day is to relate it to the moral and religious life.

I have left unsaid some things which are no doubt just as important as the things I have said. Of course the personality of the professor has much to do with the vitalizing or the devitalizing of Bible study, but the discussion of that is best left for some other person than myself.

The technique of teaching, the pedagogy of the matter is very important. I believe that it is more difficult to teach religion than to teach any other thing because of the nature of the subject.

But the discussion of how to teach religion can best be left to the experts in religious education.

THE RELATION OF BIBLICAL DEPARTMENTS TO THE CURRICULA OF LIBERAL COLLEGES

ROBERT L. KELLY

(Synopsis of an address delivered at Yale University, December 30, 1922, before the Association of Biblical Instructors in Colleges and Secondary Schools in the United States.)

In the first place, in the interest of a more thorough understanding, it will be well to define the terms used in this discussion. The term Biblical Department is used for convenience as a symbol of formal religious instruction in the college. Most of this formal instruction is done in the departments of Biblical Literature and History. In increasing measure formal instruction is being introduced under the general heading of Religious Education. For the most part, however, these courses in Religious Education are being combined with the Biblical work, although in a few instances separate departments are being organized. The ground for including formal instruction in religion under the general title of the Biblical Department is, therefore, that Biblical Departments were first in the field and now come more nearly occupying the field than any other one type of work.

The term Curriculum is used in this discussion in its technical sense as referring to the subjects pursued during the college course by a given individual student. It is not used in the particular sense which includes the total program of the college as a whole.

The term College is used in its original sense in American educational history. That is to say, reference is made to what may be called the liberal college or what is usually expanded into the college of liberal arts and sciences.

In general terms it must be pointed out in justice to the truth that the Biblical Department does not rank usually among the leading departments of the college if the judgment is made on a quantitative basis. If the departments are named which have

the largest earning power in individual American colleges, the Biblical Department is not usually found in the list. There are certain colleges, it is true, in which the Biblical Department ranks among the leading departments on this basis of earning power, but the number is small.

It may be explained further that the studies of the college departments upon which this statement is made were carried on not primarily with reference to the amount of formal instruction in religion which the colleges may be offering but with reference to the structure of the program of study as a whole. These studies, however, were made in terms of individual departments and the Biblical Department was included in the survey along with the rest.

In general, the Commission on the Curriculum of the Association of American Colleges has accumulated data which show that the curricula of the students as well as the programs of the colleges are becoming *simplified, socialized and individualized*. They are not becoming *vocationalized*, and the *unifying* agencies in the college curricula are conspicuous by their absence. The program of studies of most American Colleges is without form and void and darkness is upon the face of it.

It is undoubtedly true that the analytical tendencies of science and the abuse of the elective system have contributed very much to this confusion. With the causes, however, we are not at present concerned, but rather with some possible cure.

The student of the liberal college may find gratification in the increasing demand for unity in the curriculum. It is true that there is much aimlessness in the college both on the part of the individual student and on the part of the administration itself. There are relatively few guideposts. There is not much indication of definite objectives. The members of the staff of the Association of American Colleges and the Council of Church Boards of Education who have been making these studies are well trained. They have had much experience in this type of work. As tabulators and statisticians it may be said of them that they have sure-footed minds and are pretty well equipped for scaling the dizzy heights of curriculum formation. And yet, as they have studied the catalogues of the colleges with special

reference to determining the structure of the curriculum, they have become more and more confused and confounded. There are relatively few colleges which make a clear statement as to what the objective of their program of studies is or as to the conditions under which the individual student may realize that objective. It is hardly to be supposed that the undergraduates see ahead any definite goal.

The thing that seems to be lacking in the program of studies of the colleges is the thing that Secretary Hughes said last evening was present at the Washington Conference. You all heard Mr. Hughes' illuminating explanation of the meaning and method of a conference. You recall that he said: "I believe in conferences, but I do not have much expectation of success in conferences *as such*." The reason why the Washington Conference was successful was because there came together a group of men representing different nationalities who were interested in the same problems and were determined to find the solution of those problems."

Now the college administration is still in the "as such" stage. The question is, can some *common problems* be studied? Can the men and women in a college, students and faculty, have *definite objectives* which they are attempting to work out in as direct a way as the members of the Washington Conference entered upon the solution of their problems?

Undoubtedly, this confused situation is being recognized in the colleges. There are numerous attempts at unity. There are freshmen co-ordinating courses; there are senior orientation courses; there are group systems multitudinous; but it can scarcely be said that any or all of these attempts at unification have as yet been eminently successful.

The efforts which have thus far been made toward unification for the most part have been efforts to unify curriculum *material*. The purpose of this discussion is to suggest that the teacher of religion is confronted with a most remarkable opportunity to meet this attempt for unification, and that this opportunity applies even in the field of the curriculum materials.

The experience of the race has taught that there are three ways of discovering unity in the content of experience. One of those

ways is through art; another is through philosophy and the third is through religion. Art undertakes to unify experience in terms of beauty; Philosophy in terms of truth and religion in terms of the good. The study of philosophy at present in our American colleges is at a rather low ebb. The study of art is undoubtedly on the increase as is also the study of religion. If the unity of the curriculum is to be attained, there must be great development along each of these three lines. The exponent of the good must also be an exponent of the beautiful and of the true. Consequently, the teacher of religion occupies a most strategic position. From the standpoint of the materials themselves, workers in the Biblical Departments occupy the greatest point of vantage in meeting this unique emergency.

Now what are the presuppositions of American education? Our educational creed is made up of such declarations as these: that every American child is educable: that every American child is a social being: that all American children should have an equal educational opportunity: that there is no limit to be fixed arbitrarily upon the possible attainment of any American child—that limit will be fixed only by the child's ability—and that every American child is free to think, to initiate and to resolve. This is not all of our educational creed but the other items are like unto these and they are all easily interpreted in the terms of the teachings of Jesus. The teacher of religion has an opportunity to assist in permeating the educational aspirations of college students with the spirit of the great Teacher.

Or take for purposes of illustration the field of science. The teacher of religion has quite as much right to be at home in the field of science as in the field of education. If students are thinking in terms of the *indestructibility of matter*, they can also think in terms of the indestructibility of life and of the Kingdom of Heaven which is the symbol of immortality. If students are persuaded that physics does well to describe if not to define the power of *cohesion*, they may easily be led to see that the Kingdom of Heaven itself is like unto cohesion. If students are beginning to appreciate the expansive power of growth in the field of biology, they can scarcely be led to deny the fact of growth in the realm of the spirit. If students in mathematics and in astronomy

become familiar with the conception of the *infinite*, they are equipped for the contemplation and appreciation of the like idea in the realm of spirit. If science is grounded on *experience* and states as true only that which experience demonstrates then it may well be taken as a handmaid of religion. In a word, the teacher of formal religion has placed before him the challenge of interpreting the materials of the college curriculum in terms of the unifying principles of religion.

But efforts are being made to unify the curriculum in terms of *function* as well as in terms of materials. Just at present colleges are introducing honors courses, the fundamental purpose of which is to give students problems and to leave them largely upon their own initiative in discovering the solution of these problems. By means of the honors courses the functional value of education is being emphasized and the cumulative effect of the college course is being attained. By this method is unity found for the gifted student. By this method may unity be found for most college students, for there are few students in college who do not have some intellectual interest if indeed it can be found. There is no student in college who is not seeking life. All students before they come to college, if not after they have arrived in college, have been dreaming dreams and seeing visions. They are projecting themselves into the future. They are, at least in their serious moments, engaged in the process of formulating a *theory of life*. The indispensability of religion in the solution of any life problem it is the privilege of the teacher of religion to proclaim.

The teacher of religion has an opportunity to be an expert in this process of unification. If he assumes this attitude, he must move out of the realm of the *department-mind* into the realm of the *curriculum-mind*. He must be the students super-advisor*.

*Since this address was delivered the speaker's attention has been called to a paper read by Professor Samuel R. Braden of the Bible College of Missouri at the last meeting of the Council of Church Colleges in Kansas in which the technique of the work of the teacher of religion in this field of unification is somewhat elaborated. We take pleasure in presenting herewith Professor Braden's paper.

THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN A LIBERAL EDUCATION OF TODAY*.

SAMUEL R. BRADEN

The word "liberal" when applied to education is not a static term. In fact, one cannot be sure that there is unanimity of opinion regarding the meaning of the word. Originally it meant a broadening of one's acquaintance with the great thought processes. The Romans allowed only their freemen to pursue such a course. At first, grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy composed the liberal curriculum. Centuries later the sciences such as biology, geology and chemistry were added, along with the classical languages. Later, the social sciences such as sociology, economics and political philosophy were added. Today these additions are often emphasized more than the original studies. The more we discover of life, the more we are crowding into the liberal curriculum subjects which are considered fundamental. Consequently, some feel that the present day liberal curriculum is no longer broadening. On the contrary it seems to many to prohibit acquaintance with the broad sweeps of modern thought by narrowing one to a few studies which, because they have their roots in the past, produce musty fruit.

Influence of Practical Subjects

Furthermore, the phenomenal growth of practical and professional schools in our university systems has added a new feature to the problem. Whereas men used to seek an education for the sake of the learning, now they seek the learning largely because it will help in acquiring a comfortable living. In the midst of a circle of schools which are fitting men to participate profession-

*A paper read before the Council of Church Colleges in Kansas at its meeting in Lawrence, Kansas, December 1-2, 1922. Professor Braden is the Presbyterian representative on the faculty of the Bible College of Missouri, an institution affiliated with the University of Missouri for the teaching of the Bible and Christian doctrine.

The question was considered especially from the standpoint of the state university.

ally in life without any further period of apprenticeship, the arts college is having a difficult struggle to keep its curriculum unmixed. In some cases the arts school is jokingly said to be dead. In a recent parade in the university with which I am connected the arts school was represented by a hearse. Though it was a student prank, it was at least "whole fun and half earnest." The students are quick to see that if the so-called arts studies were not required, they would in many cases not be taken at all. Some students feel that the liberal studies are a hindrance. They detain eager souls from getting into "real life." Just what is meant by "real life" is hard to know, but there is a strong suspicion that the student means "making big money." Now this conflict on the campuses has been going on long enough to have had its effect. The liberal curriculum has gradually yielded to the demand for what is of some practical significance and has therefore admitted subjects which it formerly spurned. Whether it will cease to yield further and regain its former prestige is a matter of conjecture, outside of our field at this hour.

Three Disciplinary Requirements

Nevertheless, three rather definite standards may still be applied to all subjects which knock at the door of the liberal curriculum for admittance. They are: that the subjects be primarily disciplinary and unprofessional; that they acquaint one with the great fields of human thought; that they contribute toward an intelligent familiarity with modern citizenship. We shall consider these standards in detail.

Reasonably Difficult and Worthwhile Subject Matter

1. Liberal studies ought to have in them the qualities which discipline not only the mind but the whole personality. They ought to put before the student subject matter which is both difficult and worth while. This means that this subject matter ought to be hard to master. I am convinced that it is educationally unsound to offer courses which merely give the student a bird's-eye view or a taste of the subject unless we have made him get down and dig into it. A mere smattering of this and that in the college curriculum is injurious. That which does not require

time and thought and effort is not worthy of being in a liberal curriculum. Its aesthetic beauty and idealistic value may make it never so profitable for the parlor but it has no place in the class-room unless effort is required for its mastery. One who is unwilling to agonize over his studies is not a real student and will never be a truly educated man. Willingness to strive and agonize over one's studies usually brings joy and satisfaction. Is it not a matter of common observation that the students who work the hardest enjoy college the most? The discontented ones are the loafers. Liberal subjects, then, if they are to discipline the student must be reasonably difficult. Their subject matter must in a sense be over the student's head. He must stretch himself to get up to it and around it. I do not mean that the subject matter ought to be almost impossible to master; I am only arguing for seriousness and profundity in a time when people prefer to play in the shallows of learning. In addition to this characteristic, the subject matter ought to be worth while. It ought to contribute something toward the making of good habits of thought, which means that it must call forth from the student admiration and respect to such a degree that he will want to know it thoroughly. It ought also to enlighten the student on worth while matters. To do this it need not be wholly practical. Knowledge of the stars may never help a man make a living for his family, yet life to the man who knows the heavens is exceedingly enriched thereby. But most important of all the subject matter ought to be creative in the sense that new streams of thought are started in the mind of the student. This, I believe, is the highest function of the liberal curriculum: to cause the student to have worthy thoughts and thought habits. The same, of course, is true of a sermon or a novel. Not the ideas expressed in the words are important, but what they do to the mind which receives them counts. Such other characteristics as discriminating judgments, aesthetic appreciation, delicacy of expression, sympathetic investigation—these and many more—must be left undiscussed. So much, then, for the first test. Subjects in a liberal curriculum ought to be reasonably difficult, inherently worth while, and not studies primarily for the sake of helping one to fill a position.

Acquaintance with Human Thought

2. The second test may be treated more briefly. Liberal courses ought to introduce the student to the great sweeps of human thought. Hence a liberal curriculum will have studies from the fields of pure science, social science, philosophy, etc. This is, in a sense, opposite to specialization. Physiology, for example, may be in the liberal course, but the dissecting of the cadaver is relegated to the school of medicine.

The liberal curriculum purposes to acquaint the student with the various types and fields of human learning. Thus learning as a whole is bound together and all educated men have a large body of common knowledge. In this way dogmatism and narrow-mindedness are discouraged. Each branch of learning has respect for the others. The student gets a wholesome attitude toward a whole educational process. Such a view is not opposed to specialization unless specialization claims to be a substitute for the liberal influences. After one knows somewhat in many fields, he may then set himself to the task of becoming the master of one.

Preparation for Participation in Citizenship

3. The third test is more difficult to define. Especially since the war, educators have felt that education must somehow get into life in a very real and effective manner. It must show itself at the polls, in political conventions, in public welfare, in humanitarian gatherings, in schemes of taxation, in labor and capital disputes, in international affairs. Education must make a man under-himself and his fellow-men. He must know the very nature and essence of personality, so that he will know why men act as they do, and how to make them act differently. He must also know social values. He must have a rational conception of righteousness and unrighteousness. He must appreciate the problems men face in dealing with masses of men. He must know something of the need of public opinion back of law; for idealism in a practical and material age; for altruism as an antidote for selfishness. As much as possible the schools must lead the educated man to hate whatever is selfish and petty and to admire and fight for whatever is public spirited and for the common weal. Of

course this means that he must know something about the development of human societies. He must see his own age as one of many others in a long line of successions. He must, therefore, look back into the past, carefully and intelligently, so that he may know what is going on in the present and so that he may determine what ought to come to pass in the future. In other words, the curriculum must prepare a man for intelligent citizenship.

We are now ready to ask if the Bible has a place in such a curriculum. Can the Bible meet these tests? Can any other subject do for the student what the Bible does?

Bible Seems to Meet Requirements. (a) Both Difficult and Worthy.

There can be little doubt that the Bible has a place in the liberal curriculum. It meets admirably the first test which demands that it is both difficult to master and worth mastering. The fact that the Bible is the chief text-book used in the divinity schools connected with some of the outstanding educational institutions shows that it need not be ashamed in academic circles. Students who master the Bible always show that they have been somewhere in the educational world. Furthermore, wholly apart from the religious content the Bible presents a contact with life that is satisfying. It is worthy of mastery because of its literature alone. Harvard demands of all students specializing in English that they be familiar with the Bible. It is rich in information concerning the laws, customs institutions of ancient peoples. Its philosophy is lofty and dignified. Its variety is unexcelled. It presents to the students an inexhaustible supply of matter for careful study. Therefore, it satisfies the first test.

(b) Acquaints One with Field of Religion.

We pass to the second requirement. Does the Bible acquaint us with some field of human thought that is worth while? We believe that it does. Biblical study introduces the student into the great realm of religion, which from the standpoint of age, interest, influence, and importance is second to no other branch

of learning. Moreover, this field of religious thought has called forth some of the most brilliant minds of history. Just as one comes in contact with exceptionally brilliant genius in the study of the sciences so does he also in the study of religion. If it be objected that the Bible is narrow and sectarian, it can be shown that the Bible deals with a great system of religious thought, namely monotheism. Not only so, but this monotheism is seen in conflict with other religious systems. Also this monotheism shows a development within itself. Hazy and uncertain conceptions of the one God develop into a clear cut conception of God as a Spiritual Father. In these ways the Bible transcends the bounds of a narrow sectarianism and becomes a proper religious literature. The mere fact that it takes in centuries in its sweep and that it deals with that race of mankind which in some respects is the greatest of all races proves its worth as a subject to introduce the student to a definite branch of learning. Surely one who has not studied in the field of religion is not well educated. And it seems unnecessary to say that, since the Bible is the greatest book of Christendom, it is the most profitable religious subject for all students in Christendom, whether they be Jew or Gentile.

(c) Prepares One for Citizenship.

Does the Bible help one prepare for intelligent citizenship. Let us look at this question from four angles. (i) Our national laws, customs, and institutions are so dependent upon the teachings of the Bible that even though one be an atheist he must know the Bible in order to understand the purposes underlying our system of government. (ii) Again, laws and institutions cannot abide in a vacuum; they require an atmosphere. In America this atmosphere is decidedly a religious one. Freedom, justice, mercy, brotherhood, reformation, co-operation, these are the purposes which underlie all of our civic life. And since the founders of the nation got these conceptions from the Bible, those who would perpetuate them must do the same. Not to do so will be to make the air in which our institutions live impure and injurious. (iii) One of the chief problems of citizenship is a knowledge of what is right and wrong, what is harmful and what is helpful.

In a social order which daily becomes more complex, one dare not depend upon yesterday's conceptions of right and wrong. Each day brings forth new conditions which demand new decisions. Therefore, citizenship in this modern world demands of every individual a conscience which becomes constantly keener. Here is where the Bible proves its value; for it as no other study refreshes one's social responsibility and makes him feel that we are "all members of one body," and that the individual should not "think more highly of himself than he ought to think." These thoughts are essential in good citizenship.

(iv) At present we must get away from exclusive nationalism in our civic thinking. We must have some place in our philosophy for those of other nations and races. The essential brotherhood of man must be recognized. The Bible is the only place to go for this information where we can get at the same time the spirit in which we are to consider the foreigner. We may almost declare that we can never love other peoples apart from the Bible's influence.

Some Further Considerations.

Thus far we have dealt with the question from a purely practical standpoint. For this we make no apology since the Bible will never gain wide recognition in the curriculum of universities until men are aware of its inherent worth as a disciplinary subject. Yet, we all know that we have not yet stated the Bible's greatest value. Educated men must have right attitudes toward their fellow-men; and it is therefore the business of the curriculum makers to provide the material out of which such attitudes can be formed. My own feeling is that unless a college or university has started a man at the important task of working out a philosophy of life, adequate for all his personal joys and sorrows and which also enables him to take his place in society as a friend and helper, it has failed. In the making of such a philosophy, we need the Bible. Its system of ethics is the noblest of them all. It points out the fact that sin destroys human personality—that left unforgiven it both injures and makes one injurious. The Bible also shows that fellowship and communion with God enable a man to live according to the standards of conduct it contains.

In other words, whereas pure ethics suggests how a man ought to live, the Bible shows how to get the heart and spirit and strength for the living. Personally, I see no reason why the university student does not need this influence as much as others. And the fact that about seventy-five per cent of the students are church members indicates that there ought to be Bible courses for those who want them. If ten per cent of the students want blacksmithing or sewing, their wants are respected. Why should it be different with Bible study? The time seems at hand when church people ought to make provision so that all the students in the state universities may have an opportunity to study the Bible.

Advantages of Bible Study in a College Curriculum.

In addition to this, we are apt to overlook the advantages of Bible study along with the other studies in the curriculum. The most apparent advantages are as follows: (a) The student appreciates the fact that religion is a worthy field of human thought and influence. He gives it a high place in his own mind if it is taught in the university. (b) He can face the so-called conflicts between the Bible and the sciences when he can have sympathetic help from both the Bible and science teachers. That is, he can get help when he needs it the most. (c) He is equipped to take his place in life religiously as well as intellectually. We ought to expect the college man to have an intelligent faith as well as a certain degree of culture. Some day we shall discover that the university man without a faith is by no means a safe leader.

A Satisfactory Experiment.

Of course we wonder how state universities can teach the Bible. There are many possibilities. At present many state universities are making arrangements with churches so that Bible work can receive credit. Our scheme at the University of Missouri from many angles seems to be a good one. Practically we are treated as a department of Bible. Almost one-tenth of the students take our courses and we are growing faster relatively than is the university. In five more years we expect that twenty

per cent of the students will take our work. Three religious bodies are now co-operating: Disciples of Christ, Presbyterians, Congregationalists. As yet there has been no friction and we are in the fourth year of this venture. The Spirit of Christ has always made it possible to work out a satisfactory program. The fact that we are not separated but united, has helped find favor in the eyes of the university. President J. C. Jones and all the deans are in sympathy with our work. Many of the professors recommend our work to their students. Suffice it to say, then, that there are ways by which the Bible can be taught to students in our state institutions and it would seem that the opportunity for such instruction should be realized at once.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, let us remind ourselves that the world needs not more college men so much as it needs better college men. We need men with clean hands and pure hearts; men who will not swear deceitfully; men who are willing to be persecuted for righteousness' sake. That we must look to the colleges and universities of America for such men is apparent. Therefore, it seems that the Bible has a place in the liberal curriculum, today as never before. With the Bible instruction gone from the home, with the poor and often injurious ways in which it is taught in our Sunday Schools, it is time that we put it in the college curriculum. Not only must we put it there, but we must give it a high place. Since hatred and strife and jealousy and malice are in the hearts of men, we need a transforming and redeeming influence. Who needs this influence more than the college man who is to be the leader of to-morrow? Now, in the spirit of candor, if the Bible helps us make better men then it is sinful and criminal for us not to teach it where it will do the most good. And where can it do more good than in the college and university? It should be put there all the more since we make no academic sacrifice when we admit the Bible into the liberal curriculum for it, as no other study, can say to the student, "Know me or you must remain ignorant of life's deepest meaning."

s
,
e
s
e
r
e
s
n,
ts
y

ot
/e
ot
or
ni-
it
ay
ne,
in
tr-
a
are
in-
nan
of
ful
ost
nd
ake
eral
ent,
pest